



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/349,105	07/08/1999	CHRISTINE RONDEAU	05725.0441-0	6226

7590 12/10/2001

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT
& DUNNER
1300 I STREET N W
WASHINGTON, DC 200053315

EXAMINER

EINSMANN, MARGARET V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2001

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/349,105

Applicant(s)

RONDEAU, CHRISTINE

Examiner

Margaret Einsmann

Art Unit

1751

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: ..

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 6, 2001 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The provisional obviousness double patenting rejections over claims of applications 09/350,579, 09/287,176, 09/349,436 are maintained as applicant has not presented terminal disclaimers. While applicant has traversed the rejections, no rebuttal is needed as no reasons for the traversal were presented.

The objection to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claim language of claim 42 has been mooted by applicant's amendment to claim 42.

The rejection based on Lang has been overcome by applicant's amendment limiting the claimed dyes to those outside of the scope of the dyes disclosed by Lang or positional isomers thereof.

The rejection of the claims over Kao is withdrawn due to applicant's arguments.

The rejection of claims 1-17, 25-29, 23-24, 38-47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rondeau et al. is maintained for the reasons set forth in the office action of 9/13/2001 and in the final rejection. Applicant's further arguments filed 9/6/2001 regarding the

Art Unit: 1751

above rejection have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that the sawdust in example 2 is not a thickening polymer. This office respectfully disagrees for the reasons of record in the two previous office actions. Applicant states that one skilled in the art recognizes that sawdust is not what is meant in the art by a "thickening polymer." Sawdust is both a thickener and a polymer containing sugar units. Applicant states that sawdust is composed of a heterogeneous mixture of both polymeric and non-polymeric components, comprising 67-80% holocellulose unitssugars... Referring to Grant and Hackh's Chemical Dictionary, "cellulose is a carbohydrate polymer containing glucopyranose units in the walls and skeletons of vegetable cells." Glucopyranose units are sugar units. Thus applicant is agreeing that sawdust indeed comprises a polymer containing mainly sugar units. Applicant then argues that claims 25-26 should not be included because Rondeau does not teach the percentage limitations of those claimed. Applicant is directed to example 2 of Rondeau wherein 1 part of composition A is combined with 0.1 part of composition A'. Composition A' contains 86 parts per hundred of sawdust or 86%. Thus composition (A+A') contains approximately 8% sawdust which are then mixed with an equal amount of hydrogen peroxide, making the percentage of sawdust 4%. Thus claims 25 and 26 are properly included in the rejection over Rondeau. Applicant argues the instant rejection with regard to process claims 45-47. In the remarks on page 26 first paragraph of the response applicant argues limitations from the specification that are not in the claims. This office avers that claims 45-47 are properly rejected.

The rejection of claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rondeau et al. is maintained for the reasons set forth in the office action of 9/13/2000.

Art Unit: 1751

Applicant argues that there is too much picking and choosing to do in order to substitute a gum, starch or other sugar containing polymer from those in column 23 lines 24-31. There are only three choices given in the paragraph listing the organic excipients in the composition: (1) synthetic polymers, (2) polysaccharides [Note: all of these contain sugar units- the term means a plurality of sugar units] and (3) natural products [Note: all of those listed comprise sugar units]. Thus, not only does applicant teach the equivalence of the above three organic polymeric groups for addition to the composition, but most of those listed contain sugar units, thus reading on applicant's thickening polymer. Applicant states that there is no motivation to substitute another sugar containing polymer for the sawdust of example 2. All disclosures of the prior art, including non-preferred embodiment, must be considered. See *In re Lamberti and Konort*, 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1967); *In re Snow* 176 USPQ 328 (CCPA 9173) All of the disclosures in a reference must be evaluated for what they fairly teach to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Smith*, 32 CCPA 959, 148 F.2d 351, 65 USPQ 167; *In re Nehrenberg*, CCPA 1159, 280 F. 2d 161, 126 USPQ 383. Note M.P.E P. 2123, "The use of patents as references is not limited to what the patentees describe as their own inventions or to the problems with which they are concerned. They are part of the literature of the art, relevant for all they contain. *In re Heck*, 699 E.2d 1331, 1332-1333, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed Cir. 1983) (quoting *In re Lemelson*, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968). A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including non-preferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.) cert. denied, 493 U. S. 975 (1989). Disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. *In re Susi*,

Art Unit: 1751

440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). Applicant further states that there is no motivation to substitute any other polymer from the list in col 23 for the sawdust in example 2. There is no motivation needed to substitute equivalents as long as the prior art recognizes the equivalence. Such equivalence is taught at column 23 lines 24-31.


Applicant argues in the response filed 9/6/2001 that "organic pulverulent excipients" are not the equivalent of "thickening polymers". They are equivalent when they are defined as being composed of the same polymer. Applicant argues that a thickening polymer cannot be equated with a pulverulent expedient. If applicant is inferring that the polymer comprising at least one sugar unit claimed cannot be in the form of a powder, the examiner finds no basis or limitation as to the form of the polymeric additive. Rondeau clearly lists polysaccharides such as celluloses and modified or unmodified starches as well as "...guar gums" as equivalent additives in the inventive compositions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret Einsmann whose telephone number is 703-308-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM -4:30 PM M-Th and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on 703-308-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7718 for regular communications and 703-308-3599 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1751

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


Margaret Einsmann
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1751

December 7, 2001